

**REMARKS**

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Claim Rejections**

By the Office Action dated February 2, 2006, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,314,420 (hereinafter "Lang"). In order to be an anticipation of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), a reference must teach every element of the claim, including the relationships between the elements. If any element is not fully taught by the reference, the rejection cannot be sustained.

Evaluating Lang in this light, it is appropriate to examine the portions of Lang which the Examiner has pointed to as teaching the claimed elements.

**Claims 1-9, 24, 25, and 27-30**

**Claim 1**

The Examiner has asserted that

[r]egarding [claim] . . . 1[,] Lang discloses a sytem for associating a credibility rating with a document located in an online search comprising: an information gathering device (16, Fir.1, Lang) adapted to retrieve the document from an information source (11 and 13, Fig.1 col. 4, line 61 through col. 5, line12 and col.6, line 38 through col. 7, line 25 and lines 46-62, Lang).

an information analysis device (17 and 35, Fig.1, Lang) adapted to determine an online id associated with at least one author of the document (see col.6, line 59 to col.7, line 8, lines 9-62; col. 12, lines 39-45 and tables1-2, col. 27,

Lang discloses the credibility filtering based on the member client, Community profiles including an online id associated the author "A,B,C,D", table 1); and

a credibility rating system (400, Fig. 6, Lang) adapted to retrieve at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating database and provide the at least one credibility rating to associate the at least one credibility rating with the document

and allow a user to access the at least one credibility rating now associated with the document (see Fig.6; col.7, lines 9-62 and col.14, lines 26-67, Lang).

5 (See Office Action, pages 2-3.)

To the extent the Examiner's language at pages 2-3 of the Office Action can be understood, it appears that the Examiner has asserted the following correspondence between Lang and claim 1:

Claim 1	<u>Lang</u>
<p>1. A system for associating a credibility rating with a document located in an online search comprising:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">an information gathering device adapted to retrieve the document from an information source;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">an information analysis device adapted to determine an <i>online id</i> associated with at least one author of the document; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a credibility rating system adapted to <i>retrieve at least one credibility rating associated with the online id</i> from a <i>credibility rating database</i> and provide the at least one credibility rating to the information analysis device, wherein the information analysis device is adapted to associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the at least one credibility rating now associated with the document.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p><u>Lang</u> does not teach this claim element.</p> <p><u>Lang</u> does not teach this claim element.</p>

In reviewing the cited portions of original, however, it becomes apparent that Lang has been generalized, and, in fact, does not support the position asserted by the Examiner.

**an information analysis device adapted to determine an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document**

5 In particular, Lang fails to teach “an information analysis device adapted to determine an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”, as required by claim 1. Instead, Lang discloses “[e]xtraction means 17 [that] can identify and extract raw informons 19 from data stream 15” (See Lang, column 6, lines 59-61.) where “the term ‘informon’ comprehends an information entity of potential or actual interest to a particular user.” See Lang, column 3, lines 31-33.) Namely, Lang fails to equate an “informon” to or include as an example of an “informon” “an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”. Therefore, Lang fails to teach that extraction means 17 could “determine an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”. Thus, Lang cannot teach the claim 1 element of “an information analysis device adapted to determine an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”.

**a credibility rating system adapted to retrieve at least one credibility rating associated with the *online id* from a credibility rating database and provide the at least one credibility rating to the information analysis device, wherein the information analysis device is adapted to associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the at least one credibility rating now associated with the document**

20 Also, Lang fails to teach “a credibility rating system adapted to retrieve at least one *credibility rating associated with the online id* from a *credibility rating database* and provide the at least one credibility rating to the information analysis device, wherein the information analysis device is adapted to associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the at least one credibility rating now associated with the document”, as required by claim 1. Instead, Lang discloses that

30 Filter means 21 adaptively filters raw informons 19 and produces proposed informons 23 which are conveyed to User #1 (5) by communication means 25 . . . [where a] proposed informon is a

selected raw informon that, based upon respective member client and community profiles, is predicted to be of particular interest to a member client of User 5.

5 (See Lang, column 7, lines 9-15.) Namely, Lang fails to equate an “informon” to or include as an example of an “informon” “an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”. Therefore, Lang fails to teach that Filter means 21 could “retrieve at least one *credibility rating associated with the online id* from a *credibility rating database*”. Thus, Lang cannot teach the claim 1 element of “a credibility rating system adapted to  
10 retrieve at least one *credibility rating associated with the online id* from a *credibility rating database* and provide the at least one credibility rating to the information analysis device, wherein the information analysis device is adapted to associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the at least one credibility rating now associated with the document”. It is therefore clear that Lang cannot teach each element of  
15 claim 1 and, therefore, a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claims 2, 4-6, 24, and 27-30**

Since dependent claims 2, 4-6, 24, and 27-30 depend on independent claim 1 and since Lang cannot teach each element of claim 1, Lang also cannot teach each element of claim 2, 4, 5, 6, 24, 27, 28, 29, or 30 and therefore, a rejection of claim 2, 4, 5, 6, 24, 27,  
20 28, 29, or 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claim 3**

Since dependent claim 3 depends on dependent claim 2 and since Lang cannot teach each element of claim 2, Lang also cannot teach each element of claim 3, and therefore, a rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

25 **Claims 7 and 8**

Since dependent claims 7 and 8 depends on dependent claim 6 and since Lang cannot teach each element of claim 6, Lang also cannot teach each element of claim 7 or 8, and therefore, a rejection of claim 7 or 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claim 9**

Since dependent claim 9 depends on dependent claim 7 and since Lang cannot teach each element of claim 7, Lang also cannot teach each element of claim 9, and therefore, a rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claim 25**

5            Since dependent claim 25 depends on dependent claim 24 and since Lang cannot teach each element of claim 24, Lang also cannot teach each element of claim 25, and therefore, a rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claims 10-13**

**Claim 10**

10           The Examiner has asserted that

[r]egarding claim 10, Lang discloses a credibility rating system comprising:

15           a user interface adapted to allow an owner of an online id to input credibility information associated with a document into the system for validation (5,7,9, Fig. 1, and col. 6, line 59 to col. 7, line 8);  
an input validator coupled to the user interface in correct verify that the inputted credibility information is correct and to rate the inputted credibility information in the form of a credibility rating (see col. 5, lines 1-12 and 7, lines 26-35 and 46-62, Lang);  
20           a credibility database adapted to store the on-line identifier and the associated credibility rating (see col.6, line 59 to col.7, line 8, lines 9-62; col.12, lines 39-45 and tables1-2, col. 27,  
Lang discloses the credibility filtering based on the member client,  
25           community profiles including an online id associated the author 'A,B,C,D', table 1)  
An application service interface adapted to allow a third party to access the credibility rating from the credibility database (see col. Col. 5, lines 25-35 and col. 7, lines 9-62, Lang).  
30           'Community profiles' corresponds to the 'credibility database'.

(See Office Action, pages 4-5.)

To the extent the Examiner's language at pages 4-5 of the Office Action can be understood, it appears that the Examiner has asserted the following correspondence between Lang and claim 10:

Claim 10	<u>Lang</u>
10. A credibility rating system comprising: a user interface adapted to allow an owner of an <i>online id</i> to input credibility information associated with the <i>online id</i> into the system for validation; an input validator coupled to the user interface and adapted to verify that the inputted credibility information is correct and to rate the inputted credibility information in the form of a credibility rating; a credibility database adapted to store the <i>on-line identifier</i> and the associated credibility rating; and an application service interface adapted to allow a third party to access the credibility rating from the credibility database.	-  <u>Lang</u> does not teach this claim element.  -  <u>Lang</u> does not teach this claim element.  -

5

In reviewing the cited portions of original, however, it becomes apparent that Lang has been generalized, and, in fact, does not support the position asserted by the Examiner.

**a user interface adapted to allow an owner of an *online id* to input credibility information associated with the *online id* into the system for validation**

10

In particular, Lang fails to teach “a user interface adapted to allow an owner of an *online id* to input credibility information associated with the *online id* into the system for validation”, as required by claim 10. Instead, Lang discloses “[e]xtraction means 17 [that] can identify and extract raw informons 19 from data stream 15” (See Lang, column 6, lines 59-61.) where “the term ‘informon’ comprehends an information entity of potential or actual interest to a particular user.” See Lang, column 3, lines 31-33.) Namely, Lang fails to equate an “informon” to or include as an example of an “informon” “an *online id*”. Therefore, Lang fails to teach that extraction means 17 could “allow an owner of an *online id* to input credibility information associated with the *online id* into the system for validation”. Thus, Lang cannot teach the claim 10 element of “a user interface adapted to allow an owner of an *online id* to input credibility information associated with the *online id* into the system for validation”.

**a credibility database adapted to store the *on-line identifier* and the associated credibility rating**

Also, Lang fails to teach “a credibility database adapted to store the *on-line identifier* and the associated credibility rating”, as required by claim 10. Instead, Lang discloses that “Apparatus 1 also can include a computer storage means 31 for storing the profiles, including the adaptive content profile and the adaptive collaboration profile.” (See Lang, column 8, lines 30-33.) Namely, Lang fails to teach that an on-line identifier is stored in storage means 31. Therefore, Lang fails to teach that Apparatus 1 could be “adapted to store the *on-line identifier* and the associated credibility rating”. Thus, Lang cannot teach the claim 10 element of “a credibility database adapted to store the *on-line identifier* and the associated credibility rating”. It is therefore clear that Lang cannot teach each element of claim 10 and, therefore, a rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claims 11 and 12**

Since dependent claims 11 and 12 depend on independent claim 10 and since Lang cannot teach each element of claim 10, Lang also cannot teach each element of claim 11 or 12 and therefore, a rejection of claim 11 or 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claim 13**

Since dependent claim 13 depends on dependent claim 11 and since Lang cannot teach each element of claim 11, Lang also cannot teach each element of claim 13, and therefore, a rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claims 14-19, 26, and 31**

**Claim 14**

The Examiner has asserted that

[r]egarding [claim] . . . 14[,] Lang discloses a sytem for associating a credibility rating with a document located in an online search comprising: an information gathering device (16, Fir.1, Lang) adapted to retrieve the document from an information source (11 and 13, Fig.1 col. 4, line 61 through col. 5, line12 and col.6, line 38 through col. 7, line 25 and lines 46-62, Lang).

an information analysis device (17 and 35, Fig.1, Lang) adapted to determine an online id associated with at least one author of the document (see col.6, line 59 to col.7, line 8, lines 9-62; col. 12, lines 39-45 and tables1-2, col. 27,

Lang discloses the credibility filtering based on the member client, Community profiles including an online id associated the author “A,B,C,D”, table 1); and

a credibility rating system (400, Fig. 6, Lang) adapted to retrieve at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating database and provide the at least one credibility rating to associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the at least one credibility rating now associated with the document (see Fig.6; col.7, lines 9-62 and col.14, lines 26-67, Lang).

(See Office Action, pages 2-3.)



To the extent the Examiner's language at pages 2-3 of the Office Action can be understood, it appears that the Examiner has asserted the following correspondence between Lang and claim 14:

Claim 14	<u>Lang</u>
14. A method of associating a credibility rating with a document located in an online search comprising: retrieving the document from an information source; determining an <i>online id</i> associated with at least one author of the document; <i>retrieving</i> at least one <i>credibility rating associated with the online id</i> from a <i>credibility rating system</i> not associated with the document; and associating the at least one credibility rating with the document.	-  -  <u>Lang</u> does not teach this claim element.  <u>Lang</u> does not teach this claim element.  -

5           In reviewing the cited portions of original, however, it becomes apparent that Lang has been generalized, and, in fact, does not support the position asserted by the Examiner.

**determining an online id associated with at least one author of the document**

10           In particular, Lang fails to teach “determining an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”, as required by claim 14. Instead, Lang discloses “[e]xtraction means 17 [that] can identify and extract raw informons 19 from data stream 15” (See Lang, column 6, lines 59-61.) where “the term ‘informon’ comprehends an information entity of potential or actual interest to a particular user.” See Lang, column 3, lines 31-33.) Namely, Lang fails to equate an “informon” to or include as an example of  
 15           an “informon” “an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”. Therefore, Lang fails to teach that extraction means 17 could “determine an *online id*

associated with at least one author of the document”. Thus, Lang cannot teach the claim 14 element of “determining an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”.

**retrieving at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating system not associated with the document**

Also, Lang fails to teach “*retrieving at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating system not associated with the document*”, as required by claim 14. Instead, Lang discloses that

Filter means 21 adaptively filters raw informons 19 and produces proposed informons 23 which are conveyed to User #1 (5) by communication means 25 . . . [where a] proposed informon is a selected raw informon that, based upon respective member client and community profiles, is predicted to be of particular interest to a member client of User 5.

(See Lang, column 7, lines 9-15.) Namely, Lang fails to equate an “informon” to or include as an example of an “informon” “an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”. Therefore, Lang fails to teach Filter means 21 “*retrieving at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating system not associated with the document*”. Thus, Lang cannot teach the claim 14 element of “*retrieving at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating system not associated with the document*”. It is therefore clear that Lang cannot teach each element of claim 14 and, therefore, a rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claims 15, 16, 18, and 26**

Since dependent claims 15, 16, 18, and 26 depend on independent claim 14 and since Lang cannot teach each element of claim 14, Lang also cannot teach each element of claim 15, 16, 18, or 26, and therefore, a rejection of claim 15, 16, 18, or 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claim 17**

Since dependent claim 17 depends on dependent claim 15 and since Lang cannot teach each element of claim 15, Lang also cannot teach each element of claim 17, and therefore, a rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claims 19 and 31**

5           Since dependent claims 19 and 31 depend on dependent claim 16 and since Lang cannot teach each element of claim 16, Lang also cannot teach each element of claim 19 or 31, and therefore, a rejection of claim 19 or 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claims 20 and 21**

**Claim 20**

10           The Examiner has asserted that

[r]egarding [claim] . . . 20[,] Lang discloses a sytem for associating a credibility rating with a document located in an online search comprising: an information gathering device (16, Fir.1, Lang) adapted to retrieve the document from an information source (11 and 13, Fig.1 col. 4, line 61 through col. 5, line12 and col.6, line 38 through col. 7, line 25 and lines 46-62, Lang).

an information analysis device (17 and 35, Fig.1, Lang) adapted to determine an online id associated with at least one author of the document (see col.6, line 59 to col.7, line 8, lines 9-62; col. 12, lines 39-45 and tables1-2, col. 27,

Lang discloses the credibility filtering based on the member client, Community profiles including an online id associated the author “A,B,C,D”, table 1); and

25           a credibility rating system (400, Fig. 6, Lang) adapted to retrieve at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating database and provide the at least one credibility rating to associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the at least one credibility rating now associated with the document (see Fig.6; col.7, lines 9-62 and col.14, lines 26-67, Lang).

(See Office Action, pages 2-3.)

To the extent the Examiner's language at pages 2-3 of the Office Action can be understood, it appears that the Examiner has asserted the following correspondence

5 between Lang and claim 20:

Claim 20	<u>Lang</u>
<p>20. A computer program product comprising:</p> <p>a computer useable medium having a computer readable code device embodied therein for causing a computer to associate a credibility rating with a document located in an online search, the computer readable code device in the computer program product comprising:</p> <p>a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to retrieve the document from an information source;</p> <p>a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to determine an <i>online id</i> associated with at least one author of the document; and</p> <p>a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to <i>retrieve</i> at least one <i>credibility rating associated with the online id</i> from a <i>credibility rating database</i> and associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the credibility rating.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p><u>Lang</u> does not teach this claim element.</p> <p><u>Lang</u> does not teach this claim element.</p>

In reviewing the cited portions of original, however, it becomes apparent that Lang has been generalized, and, in fact, does not support the position asserted by the Examiner.

**a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to determine an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document**

In particular, Lang fails to teach “a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to determine an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”, as required by claim 20. Instead, Lang discloses “[e]xtraction means 17 [that] can identify and extract raw informons 19 from data stream 15” (See Lang, column 6, lines 59-61.) where “the term ‘informon’ comprehends an information entity of potential or actual interest to a particular user.” See Lang, column 3, lines 31-33.) Namely, Lang fails to equate an “informon” to or include as an example of an “informon” “an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”. Therefore, Lang fails to teach that extraction means 17 could “determine an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”. Thus, Lang cannot teach the claim 20 element of “a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to determine an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”.

**a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to retrieve at least one *credibility rating* associated with the *online id* from a credibility rating database and associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the credibility rating**

Also, Lang fails to teach “a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to *retrieve* at least one *credibility rating* associated with the *online id* from a *credibility rating database* and associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the credibility rating”, as required by claim 20. Instead, Lang discloses that

Filter means 21 adaptively filters raw informons 19 and produces proposed informons 23 which are conveyed to User #1 (5) by communication means 25 . . . [where a] proposed informon is a selected raw informon that, based upon respective member client and

community profiles, is predicted to be of particular interest to a member client of User 5.

(See Lang, column 7, lines 9-15.) Namely, Lang fails to equate an “informon” to or include as an example of an “informon” “an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”. Therefore, Lang fails to teach Filter means 21 “causing a computer to retrieve at least one *credibility rating associated with the online id* from a *credibility rating database*”. Thus, Lang cannot teach the claim 20 element of “a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to *retrieve* at least one *credibility rating associated with the online id* from a *credibility rating database* and associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the credibility rating”. It is therefore clear that Lang cannot teach each element of claim 20 and, therefore, a rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claim 21**

Since dependent claim 21 depends on independent claim 20 and since Lang cannot teach each element of claim 20, Lang also cannot teach each element of claim 21, and therefore, a rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Claims 22 and 23**

**Claim 22**

The Examiner has asserted that

[r]egarding [claim] . . . 22[,] Lang discloses a sytem for associating a credibility rating with a document located in an online search comprising: an information gathering device (16, Fir.1, Lang) adapted to retrieve the document from an information source (11 and 13, Fig.1 col. 4, line 61 through col. 5, line12 and col.6, line 38 through col. 7, line 25 and lines 46-62, Lang).

an information analysis device (17 and 35, Fig.1, Lang) adapted to determine an online id associated with at least one author of the document (see col.6, line 59 to col.7, line 8, lines 9-62; col. 12, lines 39-45 and tables1-2, col. 27,

Lang discloses the credibility filtering based on the member client, Community profiles including an online id associated the author “A,B,C,D”, table 1); and a credibility rating system (400, Fig. 6, Lang) adapted to retrieve at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating database and provide the at least one credibility rating to associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the at least one credibility rating now associated with the document (see Fig.6; col.7, lines 9-62 and col.14, lines 26-67, Lang).

(See Office Action, pages 2-3.)

To the extent the Examiner's language at pages 2-3 of the Office Action can be understood, it appears that the Examiner has asserted the following correspondence between Lang and claim 22:

Claim 22	<u>Lang</u>
<p>22. An article of manufacture comprising:</p> <p>a computer useable medium having a computer readable program code device embodied therein for causing a computer to associate a credibility rating with a document located in an online search, the computer readable code device in the article of manufacture comprising:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to retrieve the document from an information source;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to determine an <i>online id</i> associated with at least one author of the document; and</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p><u>Lang</u> does not teach this claim element.</p>

<p>a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to <i>retrieve</i> at least one <i>credibility rating associated with the online id</i> from a <i>credibility rating database</i> and associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the credibility rating now associated with the document.</p>	<p><u>Lang</u> does not teach this claim element.</p>
---	---

In reviewing the cited portions of original, however, it becomes apparent that Lang has been generalized, and, in fact, does not support the position asserted by the Examiner.

**a computer readable program code device for causing a**  
**5 computer to determine an *online id* associated with at least one author of the**  
**document**

In particular, Lang fails to teach “a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to determine an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”, as required by claim 22. Instead, Lang discloses “[e]xtraction means 17 [that]

10 can identify and extract raw informons 19 from data stream 15” (See Lang, column 6, lines 59-61.) where “the term ‘informon’ comprehends an information entity of potential or actual interest to a particular user.” See Lang, column 3, lines 31-33.) Namely, Lang fails to equate an “informon” to or include as an example of an “informon” “an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”. Therefore, Lang fails to teach that

15 extraction means 17 could “determine an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”. Thus, Lang cannot teach the claim 22 element of “a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to determine an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”.

**a computer readable program code device for causing a**  
**20 computer to *retrieve* at least one *credibility rating associated with the online id* from a**  
***credibility rating database* and associate the at least one credibility rating with the**  
**document and allow a user to access the credibility rating now associated with the**  
**document**



Also, Lang fails to teach “a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to *retrieve* at least one *credibility rating associated with the online id* from a *credibility rating database* and associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the credibility rating now associated with the document”, as required by claim 22. Instead, Lang discloses that

Filter means 21 adaptively filters raw informons 19 and produces proposed informons 23 which are conveyed to User #1 (5) by communication means 25 . . . [where a] proposed informon is a selected raw informon that, based upon respective member client and community profiles, is predicted to be of particular interest to a member client of User 5.

(See Lang, column 7, lines 9-15.) Namely, Lang fails to equate an “informon” to or include as an example of an “informon” “an *online id* associated with at least one author of the document”. Therefore, Lang fails to teach Filter means 21 “causing a computer to *retrieve* at least one *credibility rating associated with the online id* from a *credibility rating database*”. Thus, Lang cannot teach the claim 22 element of “a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to *retrieve* at least one *credibility rating associated with the online id* from a *credibility rating database* and associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the credibility rating now associated with the document”. It is therefore clear that Lang cannot teach each element of claim 22 and, therefore, a rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

### **Claim 23**

Since dependent claim 23 depends on independent claim 22 and since Lang cannot teach each element of claim 22, Lang also cannot teach each element of claim 23, and therefore, a rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is inappropriate.

**Conclusion**

It is therefore clear that claims 1-31 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112. The application is therefore in condition for allowance. Early notification to that effect is respectfully solicited.

5 In the event that any issue remains unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 408-927-3377.

Respectfully Submitted,

10



Date: May 2, 2006

Leonard T. Guzman

Reg. No. 46,308

15 IBM Almaden Research Center  
650 Harry Road  
C45A/J2B  
San Jose, CA 95120

20 Phone Number: 408-927-3377  
Facsimile Number: 408-927-3375